

Case No:	<input type="text" value="2021-0331"/>	Date of visit:	<input type="text" value="15/09/2021"/>			
Time spent on site:	<input type="text" value="4.5 hours"/>	Main Inspector:	<input type="text" value=""/>			
Site No:	<input type="text" value="FS0675"/>	Site Name:	<input type="text" value="Ardessie B"/>			
Business No:	<input type="text" value="FB0447"/>	Business Name:	<input type="text" value="Wester Ross Fisheries Ltd"/>			
Case Types:	1 <input type="text" value="ECI"/>	2 <input type="text" value="CNI"/>	3 <input type="text" value="SLI"/>	4 <input type="text" value="VMD"/>	5 <input type="text" value="DIA"/>	6 <input type="text" value=""/>
Water Temp (°C):	<input type="text" value="13.7"/>	Thermometer No:	<input type="text" value="T148"/>	FHI 045 completed	<input type="text" value=""/>	
Observations:	Region:	HI	Water type:	S	CoGP MA	M-14
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Clinical signs of disease observed?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Gross pathology observed?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Diagnostic samples taken?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>					

UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:

Additional Case Information:

On the date of inspection mortality was 1,800 fish for the site, with the highest numbers of mortality occurring in the middle of the pen group. Moribund fish were near the surface and particularly in pen corners. A number of fish were also observed gasping on the surface or working their opercula. Pens were being aerated. Lions Mane jelly fish observed on site and some fish were seen to have signs of interaction with jellyfish tentacles. Upon inspection of the gills of the fish removed, evidence of mild gill damage was observed, attributed to PGD by site staff. Site began H2O2 treatment on the day of inspection based on veterinary advice. The company currently operates both Ardessie A and B as one site. Veterinary reports are for the two sites referenced as one. Site advised that when conducting veterinary site visits to distinguish between the two sites. A bung was observed missing on one of the mort bins stored at the shore base, site staff reminded to ensure all bungs remain in place for biosecurity. A seal was observed near the site but predator mitigation was in place. Observed cleanerfish mortality is low. Inspection and remote paperwork undertaken by [REDACTED] supervised by [REDACTED]. VMD samples by [REDACTED]. Sampling F1 - F3 by [REDACTED] and F4 & F5 by [REDACTED] supervised by [REDACTED].

Case No: **2021-0331** Site No: **FS0675**
 Date of Visit: **15/09/2021** Inspector(s): **[REDACTED]**

Registration/Authorisation Details

1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative? **Y**
 2. Changes made to details? **Y**

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	14	Facilities stocked	11	No facilities inspected	14
Species	SAL	Wrasse			
Age group	2020 S0	Wild			
No Fish	114,728	1,825			
Mean Fish Wt.	2.4kg	120g			
Next Fallow Date (Site)	03/2022		Next Input Date (Site)	20/5/2022	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?			Y	Any escapes (since last visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	AGD currently on site, fish are healthy at the moment but experiencing a slight elevation in mortality.				

Movement Records

1. Movement records available for inspection? **Y**
 2. Date of last inspection: **20/10/2020**
 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? **Y**
 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? **N/A**

Transport Records

1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)? **N**
 If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records? **[REDACTED]**

Mortality Records

1. Mortality records available for inspection? **Y**
 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Ensiled - on site**
 If other detail: **Ensiled at Corry Farm.**
 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **Week 36 4.18% (4798) Week 35 0.26% (299), Week 34 0.12% (138), Week 33 0.12% (138)**
 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? **Y**
 If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:
D11 (1126), D12 (64), D13 (426), D14 (322), D15 (496), D16 (161), D17 (998), D18 (460), D19 (509), D20 (148), D21 (87) Gill health.
 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? **N**
 If yes, detail: **[REDACTED]**
 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? **N/A**
 If yes, detail action: **[REDACTED]**
 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet. **Y**

Treatments and Medicines Records

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If yes, detail:	H2O2, T.M.S.	
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	T.M.S.	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y

Biosecurity Records

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any <i>increased (unexplained)</i> mortality at the site been included?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If no, detail:		

Results of Surveillance

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Any significant results?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		

Records checked between:	20/10/20 - 10/09/21
--------------------------	---------------------

Case no: Site No: Date of visit/
Sampling:

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI

Time sampling starts/ends: Inspector: VMD No.

Environmental conditions: 1 2 3 4 5

Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

Pool/Fish No	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	P1						
Fish nos	1	2	3	4	5							
Pool Group												
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL							
Average weight	2.4kg	2.4kg	2.4kg	2.4kg	2.4kg							
Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A							
Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW							
Stock Details												
		Corry Farm	Corry Farm	Corry Farm	Corry Farm	Corry Farm						
Stock Origin												
Facility No	D17	D17	D17	D17	D17							

Case no: 2021-0331

Site No: FS0675

Method of killing: Percussive

Date of visit: 15/09/2021

Inspector(s):

Sheet Relevant: Y

S for strong presence: M for medium presence: W for weak presence

Fish Number		F1	F2	F3	F4	F5					
Time sampled after death (if > 45 minutes)		1 hour	1 hour	1 hour	1 hour	1 hour					
External Signs											
Behaviour	Moribund	S	S	S	S	S					
	Lethargic	S	S	S	S	S					
	Hanging vertical										
	Spiralling										
	Flashing										
	Loss of equilibrium										
Body	Dark										
	Distended abdomen										
	Anorexic										
	Scale Oedema										
Opercula	Shortened										
	Flared										
Haemorrhaging	Throat										
	Ventrum										
	Base of fins										
	Elsewhere										
Eyes	Exophthalmic										
	Enophthalmic (sunken)										
	Cataract										
	Haemorrhagic										
Gills	Pale										
	Zoned										
	Necrotic										
Lesions	Flank										
	Elsewhere										
Vent	Inflamed										
	Trailing faeces										
Lice Load	Estimate numbers										
Internal Signs											
Ascites	Clear										
	Bloody										
Oedema	In tissues										
Heart	Pale/anaemic										
	Granulomas										
	Deformed										
Liver	Petechial haem										
	Gross haem										
	Tissue breakdown										
	Enlarged										
	Colour number(s)		4	4	4	5	4				
	Granulomas										
	Lesions										
Pyloric caeca	Petechial haem										
	Tubules mauve										
	Lack of fat										
Spleen	Enlarged										
	Granulomas										
Gut	No food present										
	Yellow pseudo-faeces	S	S	S	S	S					
	External haem										
	Internal haem										
Body wall	Haemorrhaging										
Swim bladder	Haemorrhaging										
	Fluid filled										
Kidney	Swollen										
	Grey										
	Granular										
	Liquefied										
General	Parasites present										
	Anaemia										

Additional comments:

Flaccid heart in F1, F1 - F5 observed gasping at surface.

Case Number:		2021-0331	Site No:		FS0675	Insp:	
Date of Visit		15/09/2021	No of movements/supp./dest.				Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14		0
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26		0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14		0
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10		3
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10		3
Exposure via water		Site contacts		0	1-5	6-10	
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0					
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4			2
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6			
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8			
Management practices		None	Secure	Unsecure			
Water contacts with processors	Any processing plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2			0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm processing	0					
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1					1
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2					
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4					
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8					
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10					
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0					
	Common processes with other farms	3					3
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5					
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0					0
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5					
Biosecurity		Number of sites		1	2 or 3	≥ 4	
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2			1
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2			1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0					
	No	1					1
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0					0
	No	3					
Platform access to cages	Yes	0					0
	No	2					
Total Rank							15
							LOW

Case No: **2021-0331**

Site No: **FS0675**

Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)

- 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?
- 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?
- 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?
- 4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?
- 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
- 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
- 7. Are sea lice (*L. salmonis*) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)
- 8. Have average adult female sea lice (*L. salmonis*) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?
- If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.
- 9. Is *C. elongatus* infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
- 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when *L. salmonis* levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where *C. elongatus* is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
- 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?
- 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?
- 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?
- 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?
- 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?
- 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.

Containment Inspection

- 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?
- 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)

Cages are enclosed by a predator net

If other, detail below:

- 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?
- If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10
- 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?
- 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
- 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
- 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail
- 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)
- 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)
- 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)

Case No: 2021-0331

Site No: FS0675

Date of Visit: 15/09/2021

Inspector: [REDACTED]

Point of Compliance

1. Is the farm under inspection located within a farm management area?

If N, no further questions require completion.

Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements

2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared?

3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection?

4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area?

5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies?

6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement?

7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review?

Arrangements for Fish Health Management

8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm?

9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm?

10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm?

11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm?

12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm?

Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice

13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatments?

14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement?

15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms?

16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms?

17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area?

Live Fish Movements

18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm?

19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area or individual farms?

Harvesting

20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest practices on farms in the area or individual farms?

Fallowing

21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and the earliest date when a farm or area may be restocked?

22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites covered by the agreement or statement?

23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site covered by the agreement or statement?

Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only

24. Does the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, parties to the agreement?

Management and operation

25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?

26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMAg/S?

Site staff advised to update the FMS with a date for review.

Site No: FS0675
Case No: 2021-0331
Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology



Case No: 2021-0331 Date of visit: 15/09/2021

Site No: FS0675 Inspector: [REDACTED]

Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
AGD, P. theridion, Salmon Pox virus PCR	5/5	24/09/2012		22/09/2021		24/11/2021		
IHN, IPN, ISA, VHS, SAV PCR	0/1	24/09/2021		22/09/2021		24/11/2021		
Vibrio sp and unspecified environmental bacteria from gill	5/5	14/10/2021		12/10/2021		24/11/2021		
Unspecified environmental bacteria from kidney	1/5	14/10/2021		12/10/2021		24/11/2021		
Histology - AMGD, CGDH, GPAT,	5/5	14/10/2021		12/10/2021		24/11/2021		
Histology - EPIT	1/5	14/10/2021		12/10/2021		24/11/2021		
Histology - LPAT	2/5	14/10/2021		12/10/2021		24/11/2021		

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp
ECl, CNI, SLI, VMD	23/11/2021		
DIA	24/11/2021		

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0447	DATE OF VISIT	15/09/2021
SITE No	FS0675	SITE NAME	Ardessie B
CASE No	20210331	INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]

Section 1: Summary

The site was visited as part of the Scottish Government's routine risk based health surveillance. During the physical inspection, five fish were removed for diagnostic sampling.

Histopathology examination revealed multifactorial proliferative gill pathology, which included the presence of several amoebic cells suggestive of amoebic gill disease, confirmed by QPCR and some epitheliocystis. Mild multifocal hepatic necrosis noted in one fish.

Due to gill health issues observed on site, samples were screened for salmon gill poxvirus (SPGV) & *Paranucleospora theridion* (syn. *Desmozoon lepeophtherii*) by QPCR and tested positive for both pathogens.

Vibrio sp. was identified on plates taken from gill material of 5/5 fish. A second bacterium was isolated on plates taken from gill material of 5/5 fish and kidney material of 1/5 fish but was not fully identified and did not match the characteristics of a known fish pathogen. The level and purity of growth would not suggest that either would be implicated as primary pathogen in fish morbidity and are likely to be of environmental origin.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information, have any queries regarding this report or if any problems develop.

Section 2: Case Detail

Observations

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009. During the inspection, it was observed that mortality had increased and was thought to be due to a gill health issue, as it was known that *Neoparamoeba perurans* (AGD) was present on the site.

Clinical signs of disease included morbidity and lethargy present in all 5 fish sampled, with fish demonstrating increased ventilation of the gills. Internally, all fish had pseudo-faeces present in the gut and Fish 1 had a flaccid ventricle.

Samples

Samples were collected from five fish according to the table below:

Fish number	Pool number	Facility number	Species	Stage	Origin
F1 – F5	P1	D17	Atlantic salmon	2020 S0 Grower 2.4 Kg	Corry Farm

Results

Bacteriology: Kidney and gill material from Fish 1 – 5 were inoculated onto appropriate media for the isolation of bacteria.

Vibrio sp. was identified on plates taken from gill material of 5/5 fish. A second bacterium which was not fully identified but did not match the characteristics of a known fish pathogen was observed on plates taken from gill material of 5/5 fish and kidney material of 1/5 fish. The level and purity of growth would not suggest that either would be implicated as the primary pathogen in fish morbidity and are likely to be of environmental origin.

Virology: Tissue samples were tested for segments of nucleic acid indicative of the presence of the pathogens specified below using real-time PCR (qPCR).

Salmon gill poxvirus (SGPV)

Fish Number	Endogenous control Cp value	Cp Values			Reported Result (PCR)
F1	21.77	25.84	25.88	25.96	POSITIVE
F2	21.77	27.23	27.22	27.29	POSITIVE
F3	22.61	27.87	27.94	27.85	POSITIVE
F4	21.52	24.48	24.34	24.37	POSITIVE
F5	22.03	28.64	28.61	28.66	POSITIVE

The samples tested negative for infectious haematopoietic necrosis virus (IHNV), infectious pancreatic necrosis virus (IPNV), infectious salmon anaemia virus (ISAV), salmonid alphavirus (SAV) and viral haemorrhagic septicemia virus (VHSV).

Parasitology: Tissue samples were tested for segments of nucleic acid indicative of the presence of the parasites specified below using real-time PCR (qPCR).

Neoparamoeba perurans (AGD)

Fish Number	Endogenous control Cp value	Cp Values			Reported Result (PCR)
F1	21.77	27.90	28.11	28.21	POSITIVE
F2	21.77	26.89	27.05	26.99	POSITIVE
F3	22.61	28.70	28.67	28.70	POSITIVE
F4	21.52	28.23	28.22	28.36	POSITIVE
F5	22.03	27.52	27.61	27.66	POSITIVE

Paranucleospora theridion

Fish Number	Endogenous control Cp value	Cp Values			Reported Result (PCR)
F1	21.77	31.53	31.64	31.63	POSITIVE
F2	21.77	34.25	34.15	34.62	POSITIVE
F3	22.61	37.05	36.64	36.44	POSITIVE
F4	21.52	35.01	34.83	35.15	POSITIVE
F5	22.03	29.46	29.39	29.47	POSITIVE

Histology: Tissue samples of gill, skin and skeletal muscle, heart, pyloric caeca, pancreas, hindgut, liver, spleen and kidney were taken from Fish 1 – 5 and the pseudobranch from Fish 3. The tissue samples were fixed in 10% neutral buffered formalin.

Histopathological examination revealed the following:

Gill: Mild to moderate multifocal interlamellar hyperplasia with occasional spaces (lacunae), some filled with cell debris and amoebic cells, lamellar fusion, (F1-F5), displacement of chloride cells and some prominent goblet cells. F5 displayed some haemorrhage on the hyperplastic plaque. Few amoebic cells resembling *Neoparamoeba perurans* (F1-F5) and few numbers of basophilic epithelial inclusions (likely epitheliocystis) (F2) were noted. F2 also displayed a focal area of inflammatory cell infiltration at the centre of one gill filament and the vessels exhibited several free polymorphonuclear neutrophil cells. Some free blood among gill filament and lamellar congestion noted (likely associated with killing method) and several aneurysmal dilation, mainly noted in F5. Some fish displayed some autolysis artefacts.

Pseudobranch: Within normal range (only F3).

Skin & Muscle: Within normal range.

Heart: Within normal range. F5 - no atrium in section.

Gut and pyloric caeca: Some cell sloughing (F5) (potentially associated with post-mortem artefacts).

Pancreas: Minor focal area of inflammatory cell infiltration surrounding pancreatic acinar tissue (potentially associated with vaccine administration) (F1).

Liver: Mild multifocal hepatic necrosis (F1) and vacuolated macrophages (F1-F5). Mild diffuse hepatocyte vacuolation and some sinusoidal hepatic congestion noted in F5.

Kidney and Spleen: Within normal range.

Brain and Eye: Not sampled.

Signed:



Date: 24/11/2021

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/>

R09

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0447	DATE OF VISIT	15/09/2021
SITE No	FS0675	SITE NAME	Ardessie B
CASE No	20210331	INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

All epidemiological units were inspected. Samples were taken for diagnostic purposes. A separate report will be issued detailing the results of these tests.

Records

The surveillance frequency category of the site was assessed as low. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every third year. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

The information required for the public record of aquaculture production businesses regarding this site was verified and where necessary updated. The following records were also inspected to ensure that the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met:

Aquaculture animal and aquaculture animal product movement records were inspected and appeared to be adequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate as required.

Reports detailing the results of animal health surveillance carried out by or on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland were available for inspection.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained and implemented.

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2015

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

R25

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

The site was also inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007, as amended, with respect to section 3 regarding parasites (sea lice), section 4A regarding fish farm management agreements and statements and section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory with regards to parasites, containment and escapes.

The farm management agreement/statement was inspected and found to be inadequately maintained. Please see the attached annex detailing the points that must be addressed.

Please ensure that these points have been addressed by 08 December 21. Records or documentation demonstrating that these points have been addressed should be sent to the Fish Health Inspectorate (contact details below). The site may be subject to further inspection or enforcement action should the appropriate action regarding the above points not be taken within the time period stipulated.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any assistance or clarification in implementing any requirement or recommendation detailed in this report.

Signed:



Date: 23/11/2021

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/>

Annex - The Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

Section 4A of the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007, as amended, introduces the requirement for a person carrying out the business of fish farming within a farm management area⁽¹⁾ to;

- (a) be party to a farm management agreement, or prepare and maintain a farm management statement, in relation to the fish farm, and
- (b) ensure that the fish farm is managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement.

To ensure compliance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007, as amended, the following points must be addressed in the farm management agreement/statement:

- **The statement or agreement must identify the date of review (farm management agreements or statements must be reviewed at least every two years).**

⁽¹⁾ Farm management area means an area specified as such in the Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture